

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,

AS SET FORTH IN THE

Formularies of the Westminster Divines,

AND WITNESSED FOR BY THE

ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

REV. JAMES MARTIN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. Jer. vi. 16.

ALBANY:

PRINTED BY HOFFMAN AND WHITE.

.....
1835-6.

REPORT OF THE

COMMISSIONER OF THE

LAND OFFICE OF THE TERRITORY OF ARIZONA

FOR THE YEAR 1877

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M.

PRINTED BY THE TERRITORIAL PRESS

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

MARCH, 1836.

ART. I. *Immersion not the Scripture mode of Baptism.*

There are two questions which have been extensively discussed between those usually denominated Baptists and Pedo-Baptists. The one respects the *mode* of administering the ordinance; the other respects the subjects to which it is to be administered. Baptists contend that the ordinance cannot lawfully be administered to any but persons who are capable of making a profession of religion for themselves. Pedo-Baptists, on the contrary, contend, that the infants of professing parents are entitled to the privilege of this ordinance, by virtue of their relation to their parents. This is an important question, and notwithstanding the many excellent treatises that have been written and published on it, a plain and comprehensive article on the subject would be well worth a place in the Religious Monitor. But it is to the former question, viz: that which respects the *mode*, to which I purpose at present to call the readers attention; and to offer some proof, that, "Immersion is not the scriptural mode of Baptism."

In general pedo-baptists have not attached so much importance to this question as to the other; admitting that if water, the appointed sign, be used, and it be administered in the name of the Holy Trinity, the ordinance is rightly administered—whatever the mode of applying the water may have been. But their opponents seem in general to attach the greater importance to the mode. They hold that a certain mode is essential to the right administration of the ordinance, and that that mode is the immersion of the subject, in or under the water. And unless the ordinance is performed in this manner, they deny it to be baptism at all. This question, then, is important, because it is a dividing question among the professed followers of the Redeemer. It is important, because many able and pious men, who have been eminent in the church, have espoused the Baptist side of the controversy. And the weight of whose authority may mislead some, who have not the means of making that investigation which is necessary to a true solution of the question. Again it is important, because there is reason to believe that the controversy on the side of the Baptists arose from an honest, but misinformed zeal for preserving the divine institution pure and entire. Many of those who have advocated *immersion* as essential to the right administration of baptism, have been men distinguished for piety, and clear in their views of the doctrines of free grace, and firm in defending them—Men whose sentiments in many things

we can most cordially subscribe. And it is our earnest desire, that all who love the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, may "speak the same things, and think the same things," in the whole of their profession of that truth.

What I propose in this paper, is an essay to ascertain and settle the scriptural mode of administering this ordinance. And I trust, by consulting scripture alone, the whole truth on this important question can be ascertained. And although it will be necessary sometimes to refer to the original languages of the scriptures, for it is in these that the scriptures constitute the ultimate and infalible rule by which all matters of religious belief are to be settled; yet I hope to do it in so plain a way, that even those who are not themselves capable of appealing to the original scriptures, will be able to understand.

I trust, it will plainly appear, from a fair examination and candid interpretation of most of those passages upon which the greatest stress has been laid, that they do not afford us any instruction, whatever, respecting the *mode*. Take for example, the passage in Acts viii. 38, so often referred to—"and he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch; and he baptized him." Here we have the fact stated, that the Eunuch was baptised by Philip; but no intimation whatever is given, *how* it was done. The going down into, and coming up out of the water, were mere circumstances attending the transaction, and were no more a part of the baptism, than the riding in the chariot to the place: and for aught that here appears, we have as much right to suppose, that it was performed by sprinkling, pouring, or any other manner, according to the various meanings of the word *baptize*, as that it was done by immersion. Certainly if it teaches us that the Eunuch was immersed, Philip must also have been immersed—for the same expression is applied to the one, that is to the other. But a little further investigation, I am persuaded, must show that we have no right, from any thing said in scripture, to conclude that either was immersed; and that, were it not for such expressions as "going into the water" "in Jordan," "coming up out of the water," &c., we have good reason to believe we never should have heard of baptism being performed by immersion.

As the object of this paper is to point out the scriptural mode of baptism from *scripture*, and not from the *tradition* of men, it will be proper to examine those words which lead men to *infer* immersion; and to show that when correctly understood, no such inference can be drawn. It is clear that neither the original writers, nor the translators of the scriptures, intended to convey any such idea; but only to record the simple *fact*, where the transaction took place.

1. Let us examine some expressions used in the scriptures relating to baptism.

"And were baptized of him *in Jordan*;" (Matt. iii. 6.) *In Jordan* cannot mean that he went *into* the water of Jordan as a necessary part of baptism; for in (Mark i. 4,) we are told John did baptize *in the wilderness*. If it means immersion in the former place, it must also mean the same thing in the latter place, and then we should have them *immersed in the wilderness* and not in the water or the river.

In John, i. 28, we are told "these things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan." Bethabara is a town [or village,] and not a stream of water. If it means immersion in Matt., so it must here; and then we should have them immersed in the *town*, and not *in water*. Also in (chap. iii. v. 23.) "John also was baptising in *Ænon*,* near to Salim, because there was much water there"—Greek "*polla udata*—many waters," for it is in the plural number. *Ænon* is also a town, and not a river. If

* The village or city of *Ænon* appears to have received its name from the circumstances of its situation here referred to. The name is Hebrew, and signifies a *fountain* or *spring*.

therefore, in Jordan, proves immersion, it would likewise prove they were immersed in the wilderness, and those towns, and not in the water, supposed to be in those places, for it does not say so.

Neither the Greek writers, nor the translators could mean this, for this could not mean baptism *with* water. They therefore used this word, [translated *in*, in all those places] in another sense, showing *where* the transaction took place, but not *how*. That this is the fact, (see Matt. iii. 3, Luke iii. 2—6, and Isaiah xl. 3—6, where we have the ministration of John pointed out, and the place where he was to perform this, namely, *in the wilderness*, and not the *mode* of his performance.

The fact that the prepositions under consideration were used to shew *where*, and not *how* the thing was done, will appear more clearly from the various translations given of them, as may be seen in the following examples:

The Greek word *en* [ἐν] translated *in*, (Matt. iii. 6,) "*In Jordan*," in the wilderness;" (Mark i. 5,) "*In the river Jordan*," and "*in Ænon*;" is translated (in Acts viii. 1,) *at*, twice in the same verse, "*at that time*," "*at Jerusalem*;" it is also translated *at*, in other places, as, "*at the Passover*," "*at the last day, &c.*;" and it is said this same word *en*, [ἐν] has been translated more than a hundred times *at*, in the New Testament.

With perfect propriety and correctness, it might have been translated *at Jordan* in Matthew, and then no one with any propriety could have inferred immersion from the form of expression.

This same word *en* [ἐν] is also translated *by*, "*by the Spirit*," (Luke, iv. 1,) "*by the word &c.*," (Eph. v. 26.) It would not make good sense in those places, to translate it *in*, therefore, the apostles did not use it in this sense here; yet it is the same word used, "*in Jordan, &c.*"

Again, "*This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ*;" not [ἐν] *by* water only, but [ἐν] *by* water and blood. Here the same word *en*, is translated *by*, and it would not read properly to say he came *in* water and blood.

It is also translated, *among*, "*among the Jews*," "*among the Gentiles*;" (Acts xxi. 19.) and *within*, "*within yourselves*;" (Matt. iii. 9.) and *with*, "*with water*," "*with the Holy Ghost*;" (Matt. iii. 11, and John i. 26, 31, 33, and it is said that is translated one hundred and fifty times, *with*, in the New Testament.

Had the translators believed that the original writer intended to convey the idea that they went into the water, or into Jordan, as a necessary part of baptism, they certainly would have translated these last places *in water*, and not *with water*!

The words selected by the translators, clearly shew that they did not understand the inspired writers to teach, that either John or Philip baptized by going *into* the water; for they no where say they baptized *in* water but where such a translation of the preposition would convey such an idea, they translate it *with* water; shewing the fact, that baptism was not to be performed by going *into the water*, but that water was to be used another way.

Let us now examine the Greek word *apo*, [ἀπο] translated *out of*, "*out of the water*," in (Matt. iii. 16, and Mark i. 10.) This word is translated *of*, "*of camels hair*," in (Matt. iii. 4.) The same word [ἀπο] is translated *from*, "*from Nazareth*," (Mark i. 9,) "*from the door*," (Matt. ii. 28) "*from the earth*," Acts viii. 33, "*from the wrath to come*," (Matt. iii. 7, and Luke iii. 7,) "*from Jordan*," (Luke iv. 1,) and would have been as correctly translated *from* the water, in Matt. and Mark, and then none could have supposed they came up out of the water.

We will now examine the words translated *into* and *out of*: The word translated *out of*, is *ek* [ἐκ] "*out of the water*." This word is also variously translated, as in (1. Cor. xiii. 12,) it is *in*, "*in part*;" and (Matt.

iii. 9,) of, "of these stones." In Rom. ix. 32, it is translated *by*, "not by faith;" and *from*, in various places. as "from my Father," (John, x. 12,) "from the dead;" (Heb. xi. 9,) "from the sepulchre;" (John, xx. 1,) "from heaven," (Matt. iii. 17.)

Thus these words [*απο* and *εκ*] translated *out of* (the water,) vary so much in their meaning, according to the connection, and require to be so variously translated, that certainly no definite idea can be attached to this form of expression, to shew any particular mode of baptism, or that they actually came up out of the water. The word translated, into, in (Acts, viii. 38,) is *eis* [*εις*] "and they both went down *into* the water." This word is translated in other places, *unto*, "unto repentance." (Matt. iii. 3,) "unto the sepulchre," (John xx. 1,) and *towards*, towards the first day of the week," (Matt. xxviii. 1,) "towards God," (Acts xxiv. 15.) In (John xi. 48,) it is translated *on*, "on him;" and *at*, in various places, as "at Azotes;" (Acts viii. 40,) "at his feet," (John xi. 32,) &c. Also, *upon*, "upon the which;" (Acts xi. 6,) and *by*, "by the disposition of angels;" (Acts vii. 53,) and *to*, "to the sepulchre;" (John xx. 3, 4,) "to Jerusalem;" (Acts viii. 25,) and *for*, "for the remission of sins;" (Luke iii. 3.) In the passage before us, (Acts viii. 38,) it would have been just as well, and as correctly translated, had it been *to the water*, and then it would not have appeared from this, that they went into the water.

From the various ways and connections in which these words are used in the original, and the various translations given, it is clear that neither the original writers, nor the translators, intended to shew, by them, any particular mode of baptism, but the simple fact *where* it was performed. It says after they went into the water, "he baptized him," but *how*, is not here said; *going into* the water, was not baptism; neither was *coming up out of* the water, baptism; but after going in he was baptized, and after he was baptized, he came up out of the water; this only shews the fact not how the thing was done. Aside from the criticisms on these prepositions, these passages as they stand in our translation, only shew the simple fact that the thing was done, but not how.

To many, it may seem from what has been said, that there is no certainty in the use of these prepositions, and that we cannot tell whether they mean *into* and *out of*, or not; and therefore, that one man has as much right to say they went *into* the water as another to say they did not.

The Greeks, however, were at no more loss to determine this matter than we should be. They could, and did, express their meaning with perfect precision, by adding something to determine it; but when this determination is not made, we are at liberty, in translating those words, to select any one of their various meanings, that will make good English, in connection with the subject in hand. But when this determination is made, we have no such liberty, and are bound to translate the word accordingly. This is done by adding the preposition *to*, and making it a part of another word; or by repeating the preposition twice, and this is no more tautology than our English word *into*. For examples, see (John xx. 4, 5, 6.) "So they ran both together; and the other did out-run Peter, and came first to [*εις*] (the same word that is translated into, in Acts viii. 48,) the sepulchre. And stooping down and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet *went he not in*. Then came Simon Peter following him, and *went into* the sepulchre." In this scripture, the same word [*εις*] is translated *to* and *into*; but the determination is made to shew that Peter went into the sepulchre—4th verse, "and came first to the sepulchre;" Greek "*kai elthe protos eis to mnemeion*." Here *eis* stands by itself and is translated *to*. 5th verse, "yet went he not in, Greek, "*ou mentoi eis-elthen*," which should have been translated went in or into, if the word *ou*, (not) had not been there. 6th verse, "And went into the sepulchre," Greek, "*kai eis-elthen eis to mnemeion*." Here *eis* is repeated

or used twice, once as a part of word, and again as a word by itself, which determines that Peter went into the sepulchre. Again, (Matt. xii. 29,) "enter *into* the strong man's house," Greek, "eis-elthein eis ten oikian tou ischurou." (Acts xi. 12,) "and entered into the man's house." Greek, "kai eis-elthomen eis ton oikon tou andros." Acts xxi. 8; "and we entered into the house." Greek "kai eis-elthontes eis ton oikon." Mark xvi. 5; "and entering *into* the sepulchre;" Greek, "kai eis-elthousai eis to mnemeion." Acts ix. 17, "and went *into* the house." Greek, "kai eis-elthen eis ten oikian." In all these places the determination is made, by using the preposition, as before said, which shews they meant *into*. Thus they could and did determine with perfect precision, when they meant *to* or *into*, as we speak in English. Now contrast the difference of expression in Acts viii. 38, "And they went down both *into* the water;" Greek, "kai katebesan amphoteroi eis to udor." Here *eis* stands by itself, and no determination is used to shew they went into the water. So in all the cases, where it is said of John and Philip's baptizing, no such determination is made.

Seeing then the fact, that they could and did determine when they meant *in*, or *into*, in other places, and that they did not thus determine when speaking of John and Philip's baptizing, it is clear they designed to convey the idea, that they *did not go into the water*, as a necessary part of baptism.

If it be a fact that they went into the water, as a necessary part of baptism, and the apostles had a way to determine this fact, with perfect ease and precision, and did not do it, then they wrote incorrectly; and either through carelessness or design, wrote in a manner, if not to deceive, at least to leave their meaning in great obscurity. Such a supposition is entirely unwarranted, of inspired men, writing under the teachings of the Holy Spirit!

If in our common transactions of life, a man was to act so, we should esteem him a dishonest man. You go to your lawyer for counsel, in an important case, and he uses indefinite language, so as to lead you into error, when he could with perfect clearness, determine your case; would you not consider him morally responsible for all the consequences growing out of the misunderstanding? Or, you apply to a physician for a sick child, and he gives his prescription in this undetermined way, when he could with perfect clearness, point out the proper mode to be pursued; and in consequence of this undetermined manner of instructing you, a wrong course is pursued, and the child dies—would you not consider him as the murderer of your child? Could you confide in the moral honesty of the man! And would not this be the case with the apostles, if they meant that baptism was to be performed by going *into* or *under* the water, and did not determine this fact when they could have done it with perfect clearness? Would not the sin of all this evil in the church, growing out of this mode of writing, be fairly attributable to them? They knew this principle to be a general one, for it is taught in the Bible; therefore they could not thus commit themselves.

The case is then as clear as any manner of expression could make it, that they designed by these prepositions thus used, without any determination, (that is, without any other words limiting and defining their precise meaning,) to show that they did *not go into* the water, as a necessary part of baptism, much less to immerse; but to convey the simple idea that *at*, *by* or *in* those places mentioned, they were baptizing.

So far then from these prepositions, [*at*, *by* or *in*,] holding out the idea, that they went into the water, for the purpose of immersing, to say the least of the matter, no such idea is inculcated; and nothing whatever in favor of immersion is gained. On the contrary, unless the apostles were careless men, and did not regard how they wrote; or designed to lead

us into error, as they made no such determination of their meaning, they could mean no such thing! Then they meant they *did not go into* the water, as a necessary part of baptism.

Thus from the way and manner these prepositions are used, the fact is clearly and unequivocally settled that immersion is no part of christian baptism; otherwise the apostles were bad men, and not entitled to our confidence, which it would be impious to suppose. J. P. M.

P. S. The writer of this paper acknowledges himself indebted for the greater part of the argumentative part of it to a small tract, in the form of a Sermon, by Alex. A. Campbell, printed without any date, or the residence of the author being given. For this tract the writer is indebted to the politeness of his friend Mr. G. M., of Baltimore. When the argument suited his purpose, he extracted with mere verbal alterations, and sometimes but few of even these. And he would further add, that in some hundreds of places where he finds the original words used in the New Testament, and the Greek translation of the Old, which he has examined with a particular reference to this subject, the above argument is confirmed in the most conclusive and satisfactory manner.

ART. II. *Remarks on the Mode of Baptism.*

[Since the foregoing article was handed to the printer, we have received the following on the same subject, from another correspondent. In giving it to the public, we have taken the liberty to omit so much of it as is occupied in the refutation of the argument of the Baptists drawn from the common translation of certain Greek prepositions; as this point is so extensively and satisfactorily treated in the foregoing article. For a similar reason we also omit the introductory remarks. These two papers taken together, although perhaps containing no new arguments, do, in our opinion, most effectually overthrow the doctrine of immersion. It is something of a singular providence that two communications on the same subject should have been sent us for the same number of the Monitor, without any understanding to that effect on the part of the writers. Perhaps this is a plain indication, that our church needed to have her attention particularly directed to the mode of baptism, in order to maintain her testimony on that point with firmness against the Baptists, who have become so numerous, and who are so well practised in the arts of proselytism. Under this impression we cheerfully devote so large a portion of the present number to these seasonable productions. Let them be read with care and attention.]

The word *baptize* is considered by the Baptists, as affording of itself no small evidence in favor of their doctrine. It is a Greek word, which, they say properly means *to dip*, and so well satisfied are they with this criticism, that in some translations of the scriptures they have positively so rendered it. But any scholar can see at a glance in any Lexicon, that it is of much more general meaning, viz: to apply to a person or thing, water, or other liquid in almost any manner. And with this latitude of meaning we find it used in the gospels. (Mark i. 3, 4.) "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash (*baptize*) their hands oft, eat not." Here, application of water to a small part of the body only, is called baptizing, and in what manner it was applied, is not intimated. The hands were *dip*t in it, unquestionably, says the Baptist. Perhaps so, but in the end of verse 4th, we read of their washing (or baptizing) also *tables*, or as the word may also be rendered, *beds*; either article was extremely unlikely to be frequently plunged in the water, and the custom is well known to have been only a very light aspersion.

There are many texts of scripture, say the Baptists; that speak of baptism almost expressly as an immersion, (as Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21. These passages must therefore be carefully enquired into. The first two named are almost in the same words,

"Therefore we are buried with him by baptism unto death, &c." To be buried in baptism can mean nothing else than to be entirely immersed in the water, say the Baptists; but let us consider whether this would not bring an insurmountable difficulty into the text. The apostle is speaking of the interest of believers in the efficacy of Christ's death and resurrection, for the destruction of sin, and consequently their actual conformity to his death and resurrection in this respect. In baptism they are buried with him, but if this be only a burial of the body in the water, then, their resemblance to his resurrection must be only by the raising of the body out of the water, (and so say they it is,) but the apostle explains it very differently—"that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." There is a likeness here between Christ and believers, in that [1.] Their death was a death to sin, v, 10, 11. For that he died, he died unto sin once:—Likewise reckon ye also yourselves dead indeed unto sin—[2.] There was a likeness, in that their death was followed by a resurrection. [3.] In that their resurrection is of the same character, viz: rising to a life of holiness. Verse 4. That like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father; even so we also should walk in newness of life. When the believer is raised up by the power of the Spirit, to a life of new and holy obedience, it is his conformity to the resurrection of Christ, (and the only conformity the apostle notices,) that is to say, the resemblance is altogether of a spiritual nature; therefore the resemblance of Christ's death and burial in the baptism of believers must also be altogether spiritual. And from the scope of the place it is very plain the apostle is not speaking nor even alluding to the external form of administration; but as if intending to prevent such an idea, he twice changes the figure, while speaking of the same thing, within a very few sentences. What in verse 4, is a being "buried with him;" is in verse 5, a being "planted together in the likeness of his death;" and in verse 6, it is, "our old man is crucified with him, &c." It is therefore as reasonable to insist on a form of administering the ordinance that shall resemble planting, or a form that shall some way resemble crucifixion, as that of the papists, as to maintain that the only form must be a resemblance to burying. But the expression in verse 6 is a perfect key to the whole difficulty; "our old man is crucified with him." It is this old man, the body of sin that is to be buried in forgetfulness, and that by renunciation at baptism, and not the natural body.

The next passage to be considered, is 1 Cor. x. 2. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." When we consider the situation of the Israelites passing through the Red Sea, the waters on each side like walls of immense height, the pillar of cloud, which was also water, behind and spreading out entirely over them; what can more exactly set forth to us the condition of persons immersed, wholly and entirely, and this the apostle calls their baptism! There is one thing, however, on account of which, this example is not a happy one, viz: that the glory of the miracle by which this baptism was administered, consisted in their being kept perfectly dry: while thus immersed there was no application of the water made in any manner; and it must require a great stretch of imagination indeed to discover a resemblance, where the principal features are directly contrary. But let us consider the expression, "They were all baptized unto Moses." Not in or into the name of Moses, for that would be giving him such homage and worship, as belongs to God only, but Moses here is taken, as it is very frequently, for that system of worship and ordinances which God gave by the hand of Moses. They were baptized, consecrated and separated to it. And how the cloud and the sea served to that end is not difficult to understand. What the water of baptism represents to the eye of faith, the water of the cloud

and of the sea represented literally ; by it Israel was visibly, completely, and forever separated from the ungodly, and set apart to the special service of God : it might very properly therefore be called a baptism.

The next passage is (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21,) "when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was preparing, where-in few, that is eight persons were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us, &c." The Ark and those in it had the great waters beneath, and the mighty rain pouring on it from above, it was as it were in the midst of the water, and the apostle here calls baptism a figure like unto it. Can any thing be more plain in favor of immersion ! But there is the same objection as in the former case, viz : the water did not so much as touch any one in the Ark, and it was perfectly evident from the apostle's expression that he is not at all speaking of the outward form of administration, he does not call it a figure of baptism ; for baptism itself is a figure, and the figure of a figure would be absurd ; but he calls it a figure like to it, a figure of the same spiritual import, and in which the same element is used. The use and import we might show to be precisely the same, as of the cloud and sea to Israel. If it had been said that the ungodly world were baptized in the flood and the Egyptians in the sea, it would have altered the case very materially ; it would have been decisive in favor of immersion. And if either of the apostles in the places quoted, had had any intention of representing to us the mode of baptism by immersion, it seems impossible they should have neglected such notable illustrations and chosen others in which the resemblance is so faint, that it requires the utmost stretch of ingenuity to discover it.

Finally, say the Baptists, the sprinkling of a little water on the face, is a very inadequate representation of our total defilement by sin, and the renewing of the whole man in regeneration ; that nothing less can answer to this than the total immersion of the body. If we could observe such a principle in any other divine ordinance, that the symbol should bear a proportion to the substance, then might it be plead for here ; but this is not the case ; no quantity of water ever can represent the extent of efficacy of the thing signified ; on the other hand the manifest disproportion is of excellent use to instruct us that the benefit consists in nothing, natural or visible, but in the sacramental character of the water only. If the argument were good, it would apply with equal force to the sacrament of the Supper ; it might be said, that tasting a crumb of bread and the smallest quantity of wine, cannot be called a supper, a feast ; can be no proper representation of our reception of whole Christ and his salvation, and our living upon him ; that nothing less can do this but to eat and drink to excess, which the apostle severely reproves in the Corinthians, and none pleads for. But we have the argument and answer to it very briefly but clearly handled by our Lord himself. (John xiii. 9.) When washing the disciples feet, Peter refused to have his washed till instructed in the symbolical meaning of the action, and then, sensible of his total defilement, thought it insufficient to represent the extent of cleansing he stood in need of. "Lord not my feet only but also my hands and my head ;" he thought no less than immersion would answer. "Jesus saith unto him, he that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet but is clean every whit."

We might now consider the arguments against the mode of administering this ordinance by immersion.

1. It is not agreeable to the spirit of the gospel dispensation in two respects. In respect of *modesty* ; it is true, that the divine appointment of any rite, at once answers all objections of this kind and renders any act, whatever it might be in itself, perfectly modest ; but divine ordinances may be considered also as they appear to those that are without, and in

this view there is a great difference between some of those under the Old Testament, and those of the New; the latter being at the greatest possible distance from indelicacy, which cannot be said of immersion; but considering the promiscuous state of society in which we live, there is a positive indecency in it. But particularly it agrees not with the spirit of the gospel in respect of the *lightness* of gospel service. This was one of the greatest outward differences between the old and new dispensations; the former had many laborious, expensive and painful observances; the latter has the fewest, simplest and easiest possible. There are no journeys necessary, no great bodily exertion. It is equally suited to all parts of the world, to all sexes and conditions of men, and all seasons of the year; which cannot be said of immersion. It savours very much of the laborious bodily exercise—a certain measure of bodily strength in the administrator is essentially requisite; in many parts of the world it could not be administered without undertaking considerable journeys, in some countries it could not be administered at all during a great part of the year, and even in any country it is often a great exposure of health and life to weak constitutions.

2. We find baptism to have been administered by the apostles in circumstances that will not allow the supposition of its having been by immersion; as on the day of Pentecost. (Acts ii. 41.) "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls." Of this it has been remarked not without reason, that it was scarcely practicable for the twelve to immerse such a number, in the part of a day, in which this was done. But passing this we may notice the place in which it was; it was certainly in the city of Jerusalem, and from verse 46, it would seem most probable in the courts of the temple, where the multitude was to be met with, and in either place it is certain there was no sufficiency of water free to the public like a natural stream, for the immersion of such a multitude. Dr. Gill, and after him Baptists generally, find more than enough, and abundant conveniences also, in the ten brazen lavers, each of sufficient size for the immersion of a man, the brazen sea, large enough to receive a great number at once, the bathing room where the High Priest washed himself on solemn occasions, besides the pools of Siloam and Bethesda, and private baths and cisterns. All this however only proves to what length good men will sometimes go in support of a favorite theory. Admitting there were the lavers and sea in the temple at this time, the same as in the days of Solomon, it was utterly unallowable for any man to bathe in them; the priests who had the exclusive use of them for the sacred services, washed the sacrifices and their own hands and feet at them; but on no occasion of their bathing the whole body, did they do so in the open courts, but in the bathing rooms for the purpose. Or even if we might suppose such a use to be made of them at any time, the followers of Jesus of Nazareth were not yet so popular with the chief priests and captain of the temple, as to obtain that accommodation. The same may be answered to the notion of their immersing in the pool of Siloam, which was a reservoir from which the city was supplied with water. Now, though water is not so precious with us as then and there, is there any of our cities in which the authorities would permit the immersion of a number of persons into the reservoir? The very proposal shows the absurdity of the notion. The pool of Bethesda was a public property of the city, used for a special purpose; and what its size and particular character were Dr. Gill himself admits to be uncertain. Another instance we have in the Philippian jailor. (Acts xvi. 33.) "And he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was baptized he and all his straightway." This took place about midnight, and within the precincts of a prison, where it cannot be imagined there was suitable

place for immersion. Baptists, therefore, confidently assert that the apostles took the jailor and his family, even at that unseasonable hour, out of the city to the river near it, and baptized them and returned; because it is said, first that he brought them out, and then that he brought them into his house, as if referring to two different times. But surely this is a very unmerciful conjecture, both to the family and to the apostles, considering their wounded and painful state of body by stripes, stocks, &c. It is also a most unreasonable conjecture, for which the text affords not a shadow; it is said, verse 30th, that he brought them out, viz: from the inner prison into which he had thrust them; and, verse 34th, that he brought them into his house, viz: the apartment allotted to his own family, but still in the same building; there is no reference to two times here, nor the least hint that they had been without the enclosure, but on the contrary the following verses make it certain that they had not. When the magistrates sent next day to discharge them, they would not go out *privately* though lawful. And can it be supposed that before this they had gone out secretly and unlawfully, and still made these professions? It would discover such duplicity as cannot for a moment be admitted against them. In a word, it may with as good reason be maintained that the jailor took the apostles out to the river to wash their stripes as that they took him and his family there to immerse them, for it was in the same hour of the night, and the washing of their stripes is first mentioned. But such a supposition would be too ridiculous. Once more the apostle Paul effected the conversion of Onesimus while a prisoner in bonds, and speaks of him as advanced to a good standing in the christian church by his means in that condition, so that his baptism must be supposed, but that the apostle could immerse him in these circumstances is in the last degree improbable.

3. Wherever the same spiritual things are set forth as are represented by baptism, it is always under the idea of sprinkling or pouring, and not once by immersion. Does baptism signify the application of the cleansing blood of Christ? Through the whole Old and New Testament this is constantly represented by sprinkling. It was the blood of *sprinkling*; the blood of the paschal lamb was *sprinkled* on the lintel and door posts; the blood of calves and goats at the dedication of the Siniatic covenant, and the people's entering into that church state, was *sprinkled* on the book and the people. The water of separation was *sprinkled* on the unclean, to which the apostle compares the application of the blood of Christ, (Heb. ix. 13, 14.) And again no less plainly, (ch. x. 22.) "Having our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Here we observe that the heart and conscience are properly the subjects of this cleansing, but the terms washing and sprinkling must be figurative as applied to them and proper only to the body, the plain meaning then is that the washing of the body by sprinkling it with pure water was emblematical of this cleansing of the heart and conscience as well as the purity of life flowing from it. The only type in which dipping was at all used, (that is, *certainly* used) we have, Lev. xiv., 'where for cleansing the leper, the living bird was to be *dipped* in the blood of the slain bird, &c., of which we observe, that the occasion of this ceremony did in no way correspond to that of baptism, nor the living bird to the person baptized, as might be proved at length, and therefore could not represent the mode of it; and after all the application to the person was made by *sprinkling*. There were many occasions on which the washing of the whole body was enjoined, but these represented the washings of sanctification rather than the initial washing of regeneration. And even then there is no evidence that they were performed by immersion and not rather by ablution. The case of Naaman the Syrian is sometimes quoted, and he did indeed dip himself seven times in Jordan;

but that was no type or standing ordinance of worship, but an arbitrary appointment for the trial of faith and obedience. Again, does baptism signify the washing of regeneration? It is constantly spoken of as *sprinkling* or pouring. (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26.) "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you; a new heart also will I give you, &c." (Titus iii. 5, 6.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost which he *shed* or poured on us abundantly, &c." Does baptism signify the gift of the Holy Ghost in any part or all of his gracious operations on the soul? He is constantly said to be shed or poured on men as in the passage last quoted, to *fall* on them; he is compared to rain, and dew, and the like. And the idea of immersion in the Holy Spirit is monstrous.

4. We have in one instance an intimation so plain as to come little short of an express example. (Acts xi. 15, 16.) "And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost *fell on them* as on us at the beginning, then remembered I the words of the Lord how that he said John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. [1.] This was the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and the thing signified by John's baptism, and also by the standing ordinance in the christian church. [2.] It was administered, if we may so say, by his falling upon them, and not by any thing resembling immersion. [3.] Therefore if there ought to be a correspondence between the mode of administering the sign and the mode of communicating of the thing signified; it must be by causing the water to *fall on* the person. And we may remark by the way that this is the plainest hint any where given of John's mode of administration. Finally, when Peter commanded them to be baptized with water, and having this baptism before his eyes by the Holy Ghost falling *upon them*, it is inconceivable why he should reverse the order, and cause them to *fall into the water* as the sign of it.

From all which it is fully proved that the mode of sprinkling in baptism is abundantly held forth in scripture, and this mode only.

BAPTIZO.

ART. III. *Lectures on Theology.* By the late Rev. JOHN DICK, D. D., Minister of the United Associate Congregation, Greyfriars, Glasgow; and Professor of Theology to the United Secession Church.

On a few points, Dr. Dick differs from the views that have been entertained by many eminent theological writers, or, at least, rejects the phraseology which they had employed. In some instances, we think he has detected an inaccuracy of expression, and has succeeded in placing the subject in a more correct light. But we are neither prepared to adopt every alteration in phraseology which he has proposed, nor to concur with him in all his opinions. The statement which has been usually given respecting the condition of the covenant of works seems to us sufficiently accurate; and the remarks of Dr. Dick with regard to that statement, hypercritical.

"In some systems, the condition of the covenant is said to have been perfect, personal, and perpetual obedience; but this statement is far from being accurate. I do not deny, that it required perfect obedience in the sense already explained. The whole law was concentrated in a single positive precept, which put to the proof the principle upon which all obedience depends, profound submission to the authority of the lawgiver;

but if perfect is here used to signify universal in extent, as well as pure in motive, the obedience presented in the covenant was only perfect constructively. Adam had not to go through a course of all the duties, but to evince that he was ready to perform them as opportunity should occur, by attending to this particular duty. I grant also that the obedience was personal, or, in other words, was to be performed by himself; but as no doubt ever did, or ever could, arise in any mind upon the point, it was altogether unnecessary to mention it. I deny also that it was perpetual obedience. The period of his probation was not to be commensurate with his existence, nor indefinitely extended; there was a time fixed when the trial would end, and the reward would be conferred. To say that the obedience was to be perpetual, is contrary to the nature of a covenant, for in every transaction of this kind it is implied, that, when the stipulated service is finished, the promise will be fulfilled. But when the term perpetual comes to be explained, we find that it does not signify perpetual, but temporary, and is employed to teach us that Adam was to continue to obey till the trial was ended. But why is a word used which suggests any idea contrary to truth, and different from what the speaker or writer intended? Why should that be called perpetual, which would have probably terminated in a few days or weeks? Besides, if the meaning is, that man was bound to obey during the term prescribed, this notion is implied in the word perfect, for that obedience only is perfect which is sustained so long as the obligation to perform it lasts. Here, then, we have an instance of repetition under the name of distinction." Vol. ii. p. 346.

Though the special test of Adam's obedience was a positive precept relating to the fruit of a particular tree in the garden, and though it should be admitted that Adam was secured against sinning otherwise than by the violation of this positive precept; yet we must contend that he was required to yield obedience to the whole revealed will of God. His obedience behoved to be perfect, not only in respect of its principle and motive, but also in respect of parts, extending to every precept of the moral law, which was imprinted in the fleshly table of his heart. It was not necessary, we grant, that Adam should actually perform every duty which that law requires of man, for, in the nature of things, this was impossible; but every duty incumbent upon him in the relations and circumstances in which he was placed, he was bound to fulfil. Perhaps no one ever doubted that the obedience was to be performed by Adam himself; yet, we apprehend, there is a propriety in applying the term personal to the obedience which the law of works required. This term indicates an important distinction between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. The latter accepts of the obedience of a surety; the former admitted only of obedience performed by man himself. Upon the supposition that Adam failed in fulfilling the obedience demanded, and that a substitute both able and willing to do it had offered, the covenant of works could not have accepted of him. The term perpetual was unquestionably never intended by those who have employed it to signify that Adam's obedience to the law, in its covenant form, was to be continued forever, or even till the termination of his residence upon earth; but merely to denote that it was to be uninterruptedly continued till the expiration of his probationary state. We know no word more suitable for expressing this idea, and the use of similar language in scripture authorises the application of the term to that which is only to continue for a limited time. We are not, therefore, convinced by the arguments of Dr. Dick, that the current phraseology upon this subject, sanctioned by the authority of so many distinguished writers, ought to be discarded.

All evangelical divines harmonize in asserting, that the condition of the

covenant of grace is, the surety-righteousness of Christ. Three things are usually mentioned as constitutive of that righteousness, viz. the holiness of his human nature, the righteousness of his life, and the satisfaction that he gave to the justice of God for sin by his sufferings and death. From this representation of the ingredients included in the righteousness of Christ, Dr. Dick dissents. Speaking of the condition of the covenant of grace, he says,

"In many theological books, we are taught that it comprehends the three following things : holiness of nature, righteousness of life, and satisfaction for sin by sufferings and death. To answer these demands our Redeemer assumed human nature without a stain, gave perfect obedience to the precepts of the law, and shed his blood as an atonement for sin. I am disposed to call in question the accuracy of this statement. To the second and third particulars I have no objection, and believe that they were truly the terms of the covenant ; but I do not see that the first was any part of the condition. My reason of dissenting in this instance from the common opinion is, that besides satisfaction to divine justice, which is now required in consequence of sin, no other thing can be conceived to be the condition of the covenant of grace, which was not the condition of the covenant of works. Now, holiness of nature was not part of that condition, because man was already possessed of it when the covenant was made, and all, therefore, that could be required of him was, that he should act agreeably to the principles and dispositions with which his Maker had endowed him. A condition bears a reference to the future, and implies something to be done. No man enters into a covenant with another, on the ground of what he at present is, but on the ground of what he promises to be or to do. God did not promise eternal life to Adam, because he had a holy nature, but in the event of his obeying the command which he had given him respecting the tree of knowledge. The only condition prescribed to him was obedience, and it is the only condition, therefore, which could be prescribed to his surety. It is true, indeed, that man, having lost the holiness of his nature, is bound to account for it ; but this is done, not by substituting the holiness of the human nature of Christ as a compensation for the want of it, but by his atonement on the cross for all sin, original and actual ; and being indispensably necessary to communion with God, and the enjoyment of heaven, it is restored to the elect by the operation of his Spirit. The holiness of his human nature I consider rather as a qualification for the work which he was appointed to perform, than as any part of the work itself. The holiness of the human nature of Christ was a gift of his Father, by which he was qualified for his work, and in receiving it, considered as a man, he was passive. There was, therefore, no place for merit, although his unspotted purity was in the highest degree pleasing in the eyes of his Father. His merit consisted in the use of the gift, in retaining his holy nature amidst all the temptations of Satan and the world, and exerting its faculties in the service of the Father. It could not therefore be a part of the condition of the covenant, which consisted in active duties, in doing something which God had enjoined, and to which he had promised a reward. For these reasons, I reject the first particular which is usually mentioned as included in the condition of the covenant." Vol. ii. pp. 434—436.

We are aware that this opinion is not peculiar to Dr. Dick. Though we do not recollect having met with it in any theological work, we know that it has been held by some very acute and profound divines. But we are not yet prepared to relinquish the ancient, and still prevalent sentiment, that the holiness of Christ's human nature constituted a part of his surety-righteousness. The law of the covenant of works has a claim for holiness of nature, upon all who are under it ; it demands entire conformity to the nature and will of God ; and God being essentially holy, no-

thing can be so contrary to him as an unholy nature. Man having lost that purity of nature with which he was originally endowed, it was necessary that Christ, as his surety, should present at the bar of the law a nature perfectly holy, that he might fully answer every demand which the law had upon those whom he represented. How could it be truly affirmed that Christ "fulfilled all righteousness," and that he is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," unless he had presented to the law a pure, untainted nature, answerable to that holiness which the law required of them? If it be alleged that the law did not require this holiness of nature, it would necessarily follow that the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of nature, is no sin; for, where no law is, there is no transgression. But such an opinion is at variance with numerous explicit declarations of Scripture, and, therefore, we must maintain that the law demands holiness of nature, and, consequently, that this formed a constituent part of that righteousness which Christ fulfilled as our surety.

We are unable to perceive the force of the first argument which Dr. Dick brings forward against the common opinion, viz. "that besides satisfaction to divine justice, which is now required in consequence of sin, no other thing can be conceived to be the condition of the covenant of grace, which was not the condition of the covenant of works." It is here admitted that one thing is now required, which was not included in the condition of the covenant of works; and where is the difficulty of conceiving that another thing may also be required? If, in addition to the obedience which was the condition of the covenant of works, it is now necessary, in consequence of sin, that satisfaction be rendered to divine justice, why should it not be equally necessary, that the holiness of nature, which was concreated with the first Adam, as the head of the covenant of works, and of which he deprived himself and his posterity, be restored in the person of the second Adam, as the surety of the covenant of grace? Man having received a holy nature at his creation, was bound to retain it; and having lost the holiness of his nature, is bound to account for it. This is admitted; but we are told that this obligation is answered by the atonement of Christ upon the cross: with equal propriety, it may be said, that the atonement of Christ answered the claim which the law has upon man for obedience, or afforded satisfaction for his want of obedience; and thus Christ's active obedience is wholly set aside as unnecessary. Another argument adduced by Dr. Dick in support of his views upon this subject is, "that the holiness of the human nature of Christ was a gift of his Father, by which he was qualified for his work, and in receiving it, considered as a man, he was passive. There was therefore no place for merit, although his unspotted purity was in the highest degree pleasing in the eyes of his Father."—We shall express our opinion upon this point in the appropriate words of a contemporary author;—"Our Lord's human nature was assumed by him pure, and free from every moral stain. Its original formation in true holiness, though fundamental to his righteousness as a surety, was not properly a part of it, for its preparation in order to its assumption was not his own personal act, but the work of the Father through the Spirit, and belonged to the *promissory*, and not to the *conditional* part of the covenant of grace; but the Son's own agency, in taking our holy nature, and continuing to present it spotless, and in the exercise of all its holy principles, at the bar of God's law, without doubt entered into the matter of that righteousness."*

It has been often objected by the opposers of the imputation of Christ's obedience to believers, that, being subject to the law as man, and so bound to fulfil it for himself, his obedience could not be meritorious for others,

* Stevenson on the Offices of Christ, p. 180.

or imputed to them. As Dr. Dick admits, that Christ "owed obedience to the moral law for himself as a man, because his human nature, being a creature, was necessarily subject to the authority of God;" (Vol. iii. p. 343) he felt himself called upon to encounter this objection on different occasions, and repeatedly mentions a variety of considerations to take off its force—when treating of the covenant of grace, he furnishes the following answers to it.

"It may be objected, that the obedience of Christ, however perfect, could not be available for us, since he owed it for himself, because as man he was subject to the same moral law which is obligatory upon all mankind. Its merit, therefore, could not be imputed to others, but must have terminated upon himself. Different answers may be returned to this objection. It may be said, in the first place, that, although it was performed in the human nature, it was the obedience of our Mediator in his whole person, and consequently, that he did not owe it for himself, because, being the Son of God, he was not subject to the law. It may be said again, that even his human nature owed no obedience for itself, in order to its admission into heaven, but in virtue of its union to his Divine person, was immediately entitled to all the glory and felicity of which it was capable. Whatever obedience, therefore, he performed upon earth, and in a state of humiliation and trial, was not upon his own account; and hence, according to justice, the benefit of it might be transferred to his people. It may be said once more, that, although the human nature of Christ was necessarily subject to the law of God as the eternal rule of righteousness to all intelligent creatures, yet it was from choice that it became subject to the law in that particular form in which it was binding upon men. To them it bore the form of a covenant; but this form was incidental and temporary, and would have ceased as soon as the condition was fulfilled. I may subjoin to these answers to the objection, that it cannot be consistently advanced by those who acknowledge the representation of Adam, and believe that, although he was subject to the law on his own account, and bound to obey its precepts for himself, yet, if he had fulfilled the terms of the covenant, his descendants would have been entitled to the promised reward on the ground of his obedience. If his obedience could have been considered as virtually the obedience of his posterity, there is evidently no reason why the obedience of Christ should not have been accepted in behalf of his people, and have entitled them to the reward promised in the covenant of grace, even although it were true that he was himself personally bound to perform it." Vol. ii. p. 438.

Upon the supposition that Christ owed obedience to the moral law for himself as man, we think that Dr. Dick has satisfactorily shewn, that his obedience might notwithstanding be imputed to others. But we would be disposed to solve the difficulty by a shorter process. We would not hesitate to deny that Christ was subject to the law on his own account, and bound to obey its precepts for himself, and if we succeeded in our proof of this position, the objection which Dr. Dick so elaborately refutes would instantly disappear. We apprehend there is a fallacy in the use of the word *creature*, when it is said, that Christ's human nature, being a creature, was necessarily subject to the authority of God,—when we apply this word to human beings, we associate with it the idea of personality,—but, though the human nature of Christ was, no doubt, a created nature, yet it was not a human person; it never had any distinct existence as a rational agent; it subsisted not, for a single moment, separate from his divine person; and consequently, never could have any agency but as subsisting in the person of the Eternal Son. It is only a human person that is a proper subject of the moral law, and as Christ had not a human person, but only human nature united to his divine per-

son, we maintain that his obedience was in no respect for himself, but wholly for his people.

"Many Theologians," as Dr. Dick remarks, "are of opinion that there are two covenants connected with the salvation of men, which they call the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace, the former made with Christ from everlasting, and the latter made with sinners in time." We are not disposed to exclaim against this statement as fraught with dangerous error, for we know that it has been adopted by some of the most profound and evangelical divines; but though it was explained by them in a sense consistent with the perfections and grace of God, there is, in our opinion, no foundation for the distinction in the sacred Scriptures. The first Adam is said to have been a *figure* of Christ, who is called the *second* Adam. Now, there was not one covenant made with Adam, the condition of which he was to perform, and another made with his posterity, the condition of which they were to fulfil, but one covenant included both him and them. It was made with him as their representative, and with them as represented in and by him, and the performance of its condition by him would have entitled them, no less than himself, to the felicity promised in it. In like manner, one covenant includes Christ and his spiritual seed, and his fulfilment of its condition entitles them, as well as himself, to the eternal life promised in it. The Scripture, accordingly, everywhere speaks of it as *one* covenant, and the blood of Christ is repeatedly called "the blood of the covenant," not "of the covenants," as we may presume it would have been called, if it had been the condition of the covenant of redemption, and the foundation of the covenant of grace. The notion of the two covenants for the recovery of fallen man is now generally exploded, and we are happy to find Dr. Dick supporting the prevalent opinion, that "the covenant by which men are saved is one, and was made with Christ before the foundation of the world." (Vol. ii. p. 424) The Westminster Confession of Faith has been frequently appealed to as recognizing the distinction between a covenant of redemption and a covenant of grace, but while we can discover no trace of this distinction in the Confession, we find an explicit condemnation of it in the Larger Catechism, which entirely harmonizes with the doctrine of the Confession. "The covenant of grace was made with Christ, as the second Adam, and, in him, with all the elect as his seed." The Scripture, indeed, frequently speaks of God making a covenant with believers, but this language admits of an easy explanation, consistently with the doctrine now stated. "The covenant of grace," says a judicious writer, "was made with Christ in a strict and proper sense, as he was the party-contractor in it, and undertook to fulfil the condition of it. It is made with believers in an improper sense, when they are taken into the bond of it, and come actually to enjoy the benefit of it. How it is made with them may be learned from the words of the Apostle, Acts xiii. 34,—'I will give you the sure mercies of David,' which are a kind of paraphrase upon that passage in Isaiah lv. 3, 'I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.' God makes the covenant with them, not by requiring any thing of them in order to entitle them, or lay a foundation for their claim to the blessings of it, but by making these over to them as a free gift, and putting them in possession of them, as far as their present state will admit, by a faith of his own operation."*

The idea of a covenant of grace made with sinners in time, different from the covenant of redemption made with Christ from eternity, led many eminent men to speak of faith as the *condition* of the covenant of grace. As the remarks of Dr. Dick upon this point afford a fine exam-

* Sermons by the Rev. David Wilson. London, p. 72.

ple of that candor with which he uniformly discusses opinions from which he differed, we shall lay them before our readers. "The use of the term *condition* in reference to the covenant of grace may also be considered as objectionable, because it commonly means something, which when done by one party, gives a right to what was promised by the other. To call faith therefore the condition of the covenant, may seem to imply, that there is merit in faith, which entitles us to salvation. This, however, is far from being the meaning of those whose sentiments we are at present considering. The term is used by them in a lower sense, and signifies something which goes before another, and without which the other cannot be obtained. They do not assign merit to faith, but simply precedence. According to them, faith is the condition of the covenant, because the promise of salvation will be performed to none but believers. They hold as well as we, that it is only the means of obtaining an interest in the salvation offered in the gospel, and that it is itself an effect of grace, being wrought in the heart by the spirit of regeneration. If they err, then, it is not in sentiment, but in language; and we should be cautious in affirming that they err even here, lest the censure should recoil upon persons of whom we are accustomed to speak with great veneration, and to whom some are disposed to look up as almost infallible oracles, the framers of those public standards which we have adopted; for they did not hesitate to make use of the obnoxious term. 'The grace of God,' they say in the Larger Catechism, 'is manifested in the second covenant, in that he freely provideth and offereth to sinners a Mediator, and life and salvation by him; and requiring faith as the condition to interest them in him, promiseth and giveth his Holy Spirit to all his elect, to work in them that faith, with all other saving graces.' As, however, the condition had been often employed in an unscriptural sense, and is apt to suggest false ideas to the ignorant and unwary, it is more prudent to lay it aside." Vol. ii. pp. 425, 426.

With the first part of this quotation we entirely agree, but the taunt in the close of it, we think, might well have been spared, especially as the compilers of our public standards have not employed the obnoxious phrase upon which the Doctor was animadverting. True, they call faith a *condition*, but not the condition of the *covenant of grace*. All they say is, that God requires faith as the condition to interest us in the *Mediator of the covenant*; but to say that faith is the proper condition of the covenant, and to say that it is required as the condition of interesting us in Christ, and instating us in the covenant, are two things exceedingly different. That faith is indispensably necessary, as the instrument or mean by which we are savingly interested in Christ, and personally instated in the covenant, is a most important truth, and is all that is intended in the Larger Catechism. The term, condition, however, even as applied by the compilers of our standards, is, we frankly admit, exposed to misconstruction, and has become so appropriated by the opponents of free grace, that it is very properly disused by evangelical divines.

(To be concluded.)

ART. IV. *The Christian World Unmasked.*

(Continued from page 282.)

Indeed, *Doctor*, I begin to perceive my old sweet-heart, *sincere obedience*, is a very sorry hussey. Yet her face is so plausible, and her speech so winning, none would suspect her for a jilt. She must be packed off; but what shall I do, when she is turned out of doors? You have jostled

me out of my easy chair, and now I have not got a stool to sit upon. My own obedience will afford no *sort of title* under heaven; where then must I find a title? Beside I do not understand your doctrine, though I must give up my own. Sometimes you preach up Moses stoutly, and then suddenly Jesus Christ is all in all. One while you talk notably of being born again, and then presently you seem to speak as if my own obedience was only fit to destroy me.* Pray, explain yourself, and do not leave me in the dark. You have blown my candle out, and in civility should lend your lanthorn.

Nay, Sir, candle-light will not serve you here: sun light is wanted; rays from the sun of righteousness, or you continue dark, notwithstanding all that I can say. May this light be granted.

The law is preached for two reasons, as a *schoolmaster, to bring men unto Christ, that they may be justified by faith*: (Gal. iii. 24,) and secondly, as a *rule of life* to walk with Christ, but as no condition of salvation.

Jesus Christ has no business with a pharisee, who can plead his own righteousness; he came to *seek and save them that are lost*. (Luke xix. 10.) And the moral law must be preached in its utmost rigour, to awaken every sort of sinners, and convince them of their *lost estate*. When the law is set home by the Holy Spirit, it becomes a schoolmaster, sharp indeed, and scourges sinners unto Christ. The fox is then unkenelled, and driven from his old haunt, sincere obedience, the common refuge and convenient screen for drunkards, fornicators, liars, thieves, and simpering deists who are all at their wits-end presently, when they find their thatched hovel in a blaze.

No sooner is the rigour of the law perceived by the understanding, and felt in the conscience, but it forces every one to say, as Paul did, *When the commandment came, came home to my heart I died*, all hope of life through my own obedience perished. (Rom. vii. 9.) And they can take up Paul's lamentation, a mighty strange one to a modern Christian, who has got no feeling, *O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?* (Rom. vii. 24.)

Now they know by good experience, that *death is the wages of sin*; and feel themselves in a state of condemnation. This makes them dread sin, and free to part with it; because it has lost its painted cheek, and shews its haggard countenance. The prayers of the church become very suitable and welcome. The frequent supplication of, "Lord, have mercy on us," is neither loathsome nor tiresome. The much repeated cry, "for mercy on us miserable sinners," is not thought a cry too much. And those strong communion words, "the remembrance of our sins is grievous, and the burden of them is intolerable," are not muttered by a hollow lip, but uttered with a feeling heart.

A sinner, thus convinced of sin, struggles hard to help himself. He watches, strives and prays, and fain would keep the whole law. But as he strives, the law opens to his view, and shews its spiritual nature, and its marvelous extent; reaching to every action, word and thought, and calling for obedience every moment. And now he feels his nature's sad depravity. His heart is earthly and unclean, and therefore has a fixed dislike to spiritual duties. It may be *forced* on them, but cannot *relish* them, nor keep a *full attention* to them. He could sit four hours in an idle play-house; and though crowded up exceedingly, could keep a fixed attention all the time, and be sorry when the farce was over. But his heart goes to prayer, like an idle boy to school, sauntering every step, and would play truant if he dare.

* N. B. The judicious reader will perceive, that I have not wrote against sincere obedience, as it is the genuine fruit and a necessary evidence of faith, but only decry it as a *condition* of salvation.

After many fruitless struggles to keep the law, he finds himself *without strength*. Fain he would delight in God, and in his spiritual service, but he cannot. His nature will not kindly move towards God, and, when thrust upon the task, groweth quarrelsome or sleepy, and is quickly jaded down. Hence he finds an utter need of the Spirit's aid, to create his heart anew, and breathe some *spiritual life*, to enable him for *spiritual service*.

The curse of the law has now made known his *guilt*; the *spirituality* of the law has shewn his *depraved nature*; and his *vain attempts* to keep the law have disclosed his *utter feebleness*. Thus the law has prepared him for Christ. His heart is humbled, and broken down with an awful sense of his guiltiness, and filthiness, and feebleness; he is possessed of the first beatitude, *poverty of spirit*, (Matt. v. 3,) but does not yet know, it is the leading step unto the kingdom of heaven.

The first beatitude conducts him to the second, *Blessed are the mourners*. He mourns because he is poor in spirit, sensible of his spirit's poverty; stript of all his fancied worth, and fancied ability to help himself; *weary* of sin, and of his evil heart; *heavy laden*, with a guilty burden; and seeking rest, but finding none.

Pray, *Doctor*, who is this sorry fellow, this weary wretch, that comes to Jesus Christ with such a loaded pack upon his back? Some highwayman, no doubt, or some housebreaker; perhaps a murderer; at least a person excommunicated, who has been very naughty, and would not wear a white sheet.

Indeed, *Sir*, this sorry fellow is the Doctor himself, and every one who comes aright to Jesus Christ. Did you never read the invitation which he makes to sinners? *come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest*. (Matt. xi. 28.) You are a sinner, *Sir*; and all men are sinners, and condemned by the law: but all men do not feel their condemnation, and therefore are not heavy laden with a guilty burden, nor labouring after rest. Yet such are invited; and only such are accepted. What right have you to come to Jesus Christ, unless you come in his appointed way?

If your wealthy neighbor should invite his poor parish widows to dine on Sundays at his house, this invitation would give you no right to dine, nor yet the vicar: you are not *poor widows*. And supposing you should borrow female clothing, put on a gown and petticoat, and call yourself a *poor widow*, this female dress would not procure a right to dine, but might expose you to a cudgel. Yet this is now become the genteel way of coming unto Jesus. Men borrow at a church the garb and language of a Christian, and say most sad things of themselves, while they are upon their knees, as if they were *poor sinners* truly, and yet would execrate a preacher, who should say the same things in a pulpit which they uttered in a pew.

You have heard, no doubt, of beggars who tie a leg up when they go a begging, and then make hideous lamentation of their lameness. Why, this is just your case, *Sir*. When you go to church a praying, which is begging, you tie your righteous heart up, and then make woful outcry for *mercy on us miserable sinners*. Oh, *Sir*, these tricks may pass awhile unnoticed; but Jesus Christ will apprehend such cheats at last, and give them their desert.

Would you know where God will cast a gracious eye? He tells you, *To this man will I look, saith the lord, even to him that is poor and contrite*; (Isaiah lxvi. 2.) poor in spirit, and bruised with a sense of his sinfulness.

And would you hear whom Jesus calls? His own lips inform you, *I am not come to call the righteous*; no: why should he? If he did, they would not come in his way, for they have found a better. But I am come, he saith, *to call sinners*; sinners sensible of sin, and bruised with it; and

to call them daily, to *repentance*; not to patter over good confessions with a frozen lip, but to breathe them from a mourning heart. (Luke v. 32.) St. Luke introduces the call with these words, *The whole need no physician, but the sick.* And pray, Sir, who are the *whole*? Have any kept the *whole* law, without offending in a single point? Not a man. Then all are condemned by the law, and have passed under its curse. Yet many think themselves *whole*, or *nearly whole*, and therefore see no *need*, or *little need* of Christ's atonement. Alas for such! when the stone they have rejected falls upon them it will grind them unto powder. But the *sick* need a physician: they feel that woful sickness, the *plague of the heart*. (1 Kings, viii. 38,) and lothe themselves in dust and ashes.

But we must take a little further notice of our young pilgrim, before we drop him altogether. He was left disconsolate, with raw back and weeping eyes, just flogged out of Moses' school, and seeking balm to heal his wounds but finding none. At length the invitation of Jesus reaches his ears, *Come unto me, thou heavy laden soul, and I will give thee rest.* He hears and wonders, listens and is pleased. A gleam of joy steals into his heart; a joy he never felt before, springing from a cheering hope and dawning prospect of deliverance. This kindles high esteem and kind affection for the Saviour, who appears all lovely in his sight, and often draws an heavenly tear from his eyes. The name of Jesus groweth musical, his love adorable, and his salvation above all things desirable.

The weeping sinner enters now upon a new world, and joins himself with the praying citizens of Zion. Jesus is welcomed as his King and Saviour, and receives hosannahs from him. He begins to understand what grace means, even mercy, rich mercy, freely shewn to a lost and ruined sinner. No sermon suits him now, but what directs his heart to Jesus, and sets the Saviour forth as prophet, priest and king, to save his people. A full and free salvation captivates his heart: 'tis just the thing he wants, and therefore highly welcome. And whilst the tidings of this royal grace are sounding in his ears, he seems to give them credit; but when the book is laid aside, or sermon over, fresh doubts arise which must perplex him. His understanding is enlightened, but his heart retains a *legal bias*, and a secret harping after merit still. Sometimes he fears the gospel-tidings are so good, they are not true; or if they may be true, they are too good for him. He likes and wants the promised grace, but *staggers* at the promise. A sense of guilt and his uncleanness to dismay him, that he dares not bring a filthy naked soul to Jesus to be washed and clothed by him.

Sincere obedience often peeps again, and bids the pilgrim wash himself first, and Jesus Christ shall *rinse* him afterwards; bids him plant a fig-leaf here and there, and make a patched frock of duty; and if it prove too scanty, Jesus Christ shall eke it out with his fine linen. This expedient pleases for a season, and to work he goes, hoping to make himself so fair and tight, that Jesus Christ shall fall in love with him, and give him *rare commendation* instead of *free pardon*. But *though he wash himself in snow water, and make his hands exceedingly clean, he is plunged in the ditch again, and his own clothes abhor him.* (Job ix. 30, 31.) Thus he grows bewildered, and has lost the sight of grace, until he hears it preached afresh; and then he drops the snow-water, and hastens to the *fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness.* (Zech. xiii. 1.) He stands upon the brink, but cannot enter; and longeth for a washing, but must wait the moving of the water. He views the fountain, and sees it *fair and open*; he views the promise, and sees it *full and clear*; *He that believeth shall be saved*; which makes him cry, "Oh, that I could believe the promise; Jesus then would save me: but my heart staggers, and when my foot seems fixed upon the rock, a sudden gust of doubts blows me into the mire again."

Now he knows the meaning of St. Paul's words, *Believe in Christ Jesus and thou shalt be saved*, (Acts xvi. 31,) and he clearly understands that his want of pardon, peace and holiness, is owing to his want of faith. If he could believe, Jesus Christ would fulfil his promise : it would be *done according to his faith*. (Matt. ix. 28, 29—Matt. xv. 28. Luke vii. 50.—Luke xviii. 42.) Jesus Christ would save him from the *guilt and power* of sin.

This makes him feel his want of faith, and want of power to give it. He had been nursed in a Christian land, and thought a mere assent to scripture was sufficient ground to make him a believer ; and he marvelled that some preachers made a mighty stir about this easy matter. But he finds this human faith will neither purify his heart, nor wash his conscience : it will not save him from sin. And he feels that prayer is nothing, and procureth nothing, without divine faith. He sees a reason why the chosen twelve should say, *Lord, increase our faith*, because it is the gift of God. Could they give themselves one grain, they might add another, yea, a dozen grains, or twenty ; and had no need to ask for that which they could give themselves. Besides, these men, who ask for faith, were not heathen men, but Christian men, true followers of Christ ; and none but such can pray for faith, with a hearty feeling of their want of it.

Doctor, you talk mightily of unbelievers ; pray, where may they grow ? In Lapland, among the witches ; or in Greenland, among the whale-fishers ? Sure the people of England are staunch believers, and very good Christians. A modern set, I own, is started up among us, who think it courage to defy their Maker, and *act as freely* as if they could controul him ; and if they *think as freely* as they act, may well be called *free-thinkers*. Such people cannot value Jesus Christ, because he brings hell-tidings to their ears. Who can love a messenger of ill news ? Mahomet would prove a sweeter prophet for this light-heeled gentry ; and would gain much credit, could he gain the pulpit, for he allows men concubines enough. However, these are but a few rotten pears among the heap ; the rest are sound ; and I can vouch for my own parish, they are all believers. Indeed, *Doctor*, it would do you good to see how smirkingly they go to church in summer ; and how tidily they look at church, with their better coats and gowns on.

Oh, Sir, the lifeless manner in which people pray, or hear the word of God at church, sheweth plainly, that they have no property in the blessings of the gospel. Glorious things are spoken in the scripture, but they make a mighty small impression on a Christian congregation. The heavenly tidings fall into their heavy ears, like money dropt into a dead man's hand. No comfort is received from the money or the tidings, because they both are dead, and have no interest in them.

If you, Sir, was an heir to a fine estate, your bosom would be often warmed with the joyful prospect ; but your father's servant could not feel your joy. His bosom would not glow, when the fields are viewed, or when the rents are paid. And wherefore ? Because he is not the heir.

A Bible is the precious store-house, and the magna charta of a christian. There he reads of his heavenly Father's love, and of his dying Saviour's legacies. There he sees a map of his travels through the wilderness, and a landscape too of Canaan. And when he climbs on Pisgah's top, and views the promised land, his heart begins to burn, delighted with the blessed prospect, and amazed at the rich and free salvation. But a mere professor, though a decent one, looks on the Bible as a dull book ; and peruseth it with such indifference, as you would read the title-deeds belonging to another man's estate.

I am amazed, to hear you vouch for your parish, as a whole flock of believers. Such a thing was never known before, and would make an eighth wonder of the world. Why, Sir, are there none among you, that

are slaves to divers lusts and pleasures? None, that live in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another? Have you no drunkards nor whoremongers, no sabbath-breakers nor common swearers, no extortioners nor covetous, no liars nor thieves, no lazy hands that will not work, and no light minds that cannot pray? If you think such church-goers are believers, I may fairly rank satan at the head; because he stands possessed of their faith, and is the noble captain of this troop. A troop, which often maketh up three quarters of a parish.

Jesus says, *He that believeth, shall be saved.* Saved from what? Why, from the *guilt* and *power* of sin. Such is Christ's salvation here on earth. But this black troop is visibly and wilfully under the power of sin; and therefore cannot have that faith which saves from sin.

Thus at one reckoning, the greater part of your sheep prove goats or wolves; but a remnant is behind of *decent* people, the modern soft phrase for a Christian. Let these decent people take a decent trial: it will not hurt them, if they are good men and true.

St. Paul says, *Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith..* (2 Cor. xiii. 5.) He takes it not for granted that Christian professors must be true believers, but commands them all to *prove their own selves*; and drops a question, as a touchstone, to prove themselves by. A strange question it must seem to such as have not true faith, yet is a most important question, and the only one that distinguisheth true faith from counterfeit. The apostle does not ask the Corinthians whether they are sober, honest, charitable, church-going people, the present pigmy standard for a Christian soldier; but he asks a very searching question, even this, *Know ye not that Jesus Christ is in you?* And declares, if they knew it not, they must be *reprobates*, disapproved of God as hypocrites, notwithstanding all their decent carriage.

The meaning of St. Paul's question is plainly this, *Know ye not that the Spirit of Christ is in you?* For where Christ's Spirit is, there is he. The same kind of question is asked in the first epistle, *Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* (1 Cor. iii. 16.)

Very right, Doctor, here we are agreed. All Christians, to be sure, must have the Spirit of Christ; and though we feel it not, but are utter strangers to its influence, we must be supposed to have it; because we are born in a Christian land, wear a Christian name, breathe a wholesome Christian air, have a pew in some Christian church, keep a merry Christmas every year, and bury upon Christian ground. Here is proof enough, Doctor.

Yes, Sir, proof enough that you live in a Christian land, but no proof that you are a Christian people. To suppose you have the Spirit's presence, and yet remain an utter stranger to its influence, is the topmost tower of enthusiasm, the soaring pinnacle on which its floating weathercock is fixed. So! this blessed guest comes to lurk in your bosom, like a spy in a camp; or like a thief in a cellar; and stealeth in, and stealeth out, without your notice: mighty fine! But you are not such a wild enthusiast in common life, as to suppose there is money in your pocket, when you feel none; or bank-notes in your drawer, when you find none. If you never feel any symptoms of patience, you cannot well suppose yourself possessed of any; and why should you dream of the Spirit's presence, when you never find any tokens of it?

The Spirit's influence must be felt, or it cannot profit; and the very offices of the Holy Spirit do suppose and warrant such a *feeling*. Let me mention some of them, which are these, *to quicken*, (John vi. 63. 2 Cor. iii. 6,) *to strengthen mightily*, (Eph. iii. 16,) *to witness our adoption*, (Rom. viii. 15, 16,) and *to bring heavenly joy*, (Acts ix. 31. 1 Thes. i. 6. Rom. xiv. 17.) Now, Sir, what avails that *quickening* which I cannot see! It

leaves me just as heartless to spiritual duty, as it found me. And what advantage does that *mighty strengthening* bring, which is not perceived by me? It yields no further power to subdue my lusts than I had before. And of what service is that *witness* in the court of conscience, who speaks in such a low or mumbling tone, that none can hear or understand him? I am just as well without his evidence as with it. And lastly, of what use or value is that *heavenly joy*, which I can have no taste of? All this is just the picture of Isaiah's hungry man, who *dreamt he was eating, but awoke and was empty*. (Isa. xxix. 8.)

But, Sir, St. Paul did not ask this idle question, "Do you *suppose* the Spirit of Christ is in you?" All the Church at Corinth, and all the churchmen in Great Britain, might have answered quick, "Yes, Mr. Paul, we do *suppose* it." But he asks a weighty question, "Do ye *know* it?" Have you real experience, or heart felt knowledge, that the Spirit of Christ is in you? Are you acquainted with his operation? Do you *know* it?

St. Paul may ask this question safely, because his name is canonised, and his bones are mouldered into dust; but if a living preacher ask the same question, the world cry out, enthusiasm! And yet St. Paul makes this very *knowledge* the evidence of true faith; and accounteth other faith, which produceth not this knowledge, to be counterfeit; and the men themselves to be reprobates.

Jesus saith to his disciples, *Ye know the Spirit, for he dwelleth with you*. (John xiv. 17.) His words carry this plain meaning, that where the Spirit dwells, he makes his presence *known* by his operations on the heart.

St. John tells the whole Christian church, *Hereby we know that Christ dwelleth in us, by his Spirit, which he hath given us*. (1 John iii. 24. iv. 13.) We *know* the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in us, and thereby are assured of our union with Christ. And, like as Paul had done before, he proposeth this knowledge as a touchstone to try your profession: *hereby we know that Christ dwelleth in us*.

Indeed, Doctor, I am a stranger to the Holy Spirit's influence, yet do not seem disposed to question my profession. Still I think my faith is sound, like any roach; and am sure there is no better in the parish. The vicar never questioned it; and why should you? It is not mighty civil. Besides, I am free of my beer, and have the good luck to be loved by every one: scarce a dog will bark at me. "As honest as the old grazier," is a common saying; and this alone is proof enough, that I must be a Christian.

Indeed, Sir, this alone is proof enough against your Christianity. *While you are of the world, the world will love you: but when you cease to be of the world, and are chosen out of the world, the world will hate you*. (John xv. 19.) It hated Jesus Christ, and will hate every true disciple.

Paul affirms peremptorily, *Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution*. (2 Tim. iii. 12.) Live *where* you will, in a Christian or a heathen land; live *when* you will, in the present or a distant age, Paul affirms universally of real Christians, *Yea, they all shall suffer persecution*. If you lead what the world calls a godly life, you will have the world's commendation. You may be sober, and honest, and friendly; you may pray, and give alms; and fast too, if you please; and, while these things are doing by your own strength, and made a ground of acceptance with God, you are waxing godly *in yourself*, or from yourself, made godly by the world's spirit, and the world will applaud you. But if once you grow godly in *Christ Jesus*; renouncing all your wisdom strength and righteousness; and come to Jesus, as a lost sinner, seeking all supplies from him, resting all your hope upon him, making him your all in every thing, and counting all things utter dross in comparison of him then the world will hate you, and lift a heel against

you. A godly life in *Christ Jesus* thwarteth human pride, and staineth all its glory, which will not be suffered very patiently.

Men are apt to bless themselves in the world's esteem; and look upon it as a kindly token that the Lord accepts them. To rectify the judgment, and sweep away deceitful hopes, arising from the world's good name, Christ has dropt a *curse* upon it, saying, *Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you.* (Luke vi. 26.) This is one of the Lord's *Shibboleths*, (Judges xii. 6,) which he useth to alarm a decent professor, the world's favorite. It is a frightful ugly bridge upon the king's highway. An Israelite goes over safely, but no Edomite can pass it. Esau, the elder brother, will not travel here, but trudgeth down to a ferry, built by Mr. *Fairspeech*, to make a smoother passage over the river.

So much for the world's esteem: happy is the man who has lost it wholly and honestly. But your faith, Sir, must be canvassed a little more. You are a grazier, it seems; and when you buy a bullock at a fair, you do not take the salesman's word, but feel the beast yourself, and examine all its points minutely. Now, Sir, do the same by your faith; take it not on trust as recommended by your neighbor, but examine it, and handle all its points by the word of God. Faith is an active and a fruitful thing: its fruit is pleasant both to God and man. And the man, who does possess it, is a noble man indeed, an heir of God through Christ. But it behoves us to be wary, for counterfeit faith, like counterfeit gold, is very current.

Paul says, *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ*, (Rom. v. 1,) (ἐφ' ἧν ἔχομεν) *we have peace, or possess it*; for what we *have*, we must possess. Now this peace is given to assure the conscience, that God is at peace with us, that he is reconciled, and has forgiven all our trespasses. And whoever feels this peace, must be assured of the pardon of his sins: it is the witness of his pardon.

This blessed peace does not grow in nature's garden, nor can be digged out of mines of human merit. It was lost in Paradise, and is *only* found at Calvary. It is called the peace of God, because it is of God's bestowing, and bestowed through Jesus Christ *alone*.

Where this peace is bestowed, it is found to be as Paul describes it, *A peace passing all understanding.* (Phil. iv. 7.) A peace, so exquisitely rich, that none can understand what it is, until he feels it; and when he feels it, never can express it. Men may mistake this peace, before they taste it, as ten thousands do; and take up with an *human calm*, instead of it; but he who feels it, never can mistake it; for nothing else is like it; it passeth all understanding.

The Holy Spirit seals this peace upon the conscience, and thereby proclaims the pardon of sin, and *sheds abroad the love of God into the heart*, (Rom. v. 1—5,) and *beareth witness to our adoption.* (Rom. viii. 15, 16.)

This sealing of the Holy Spirit is given, as an *earnest of our future inheritance*; (Eph. i. 13, 14,) it is a heavenly pledge, dropt into the bosom, to assure us of our interest in Christ. Thus conscience is delivered from the fear of wrath, and *fear of death, which bringeth bondage*; (Heb. ii. 15,) the heart rejoices now in God, as a reconciled God; calls him *Father by the Spirit of adoption*; (Gal. iv. 5, 6,) delighteth in his blessed service, and feels the meaning of St. Peter's words, *Believing in Christ Jesus, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory.* (1 Pet. i. 8.)

These are weighty words; directed unto all believing churches, and experienced by them: but never were, and never will be felt by a mere human faith, springing from the human intellect. The faith, producing heavenly peace, and the peace produced, are both the gift of God.

By the help of this divine faith, the happy Christian now repeats his church hymns with truth and pleasure, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour." Or with old Simeon,

"Let thy servant depart in peace, O Lord, for mine eyes have *seen* thy salvation."

Now, Sir, hear what your own peace is. You feel no distress of mind, but are mighty easy; and your calm which is a *dead calm*, ariseth from your character, though a sinful character at best. Your peace brings no heavenly joy, and so comes not from heaven; neither does it flow *entirely* through the golden conduit of the Saviour's merit, but drippeth from a rotten wooden pipe off your own duties. You are, it seems, a cheerful harmless creature, like a robin-red-breast, who is much respected every where; and you frequent the church, as many a pious mouse will, yet does not like her quarters: prayer-books are dry champing; a pantry suits her better. And you see many, who are worse than yourself abundantly, which makes you hope your state is good; and while outward things go smooth, your *calm* continues. But when calamities come on, and thicken as they come, your peace is gone: it cannot stand a tempest. And when your soul is hovering on a sick bed for its flight, it will either feel a *dead security*, or take a *frightful leap* into another world. Unless you are supported by divine faith you cannot sing the Christian's dying song, *O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?*

(To be continued.)

ART. V. The Associate Reformed Synod of the North.

To the Editor of the Religious Monitor:

DEAR SIR—Through the attention of a friend, I have received the Christian Magazine, for January, 1836, containing some notice of a remark respecting the Associate Reformed Church, which I conceived it my duty to make on taking leave of the patrons of the Religious Monitor. Now, although I cannot consent to have any intercourse, nor controversy with the editor of the Christian Magazine, personally considered, so long as he continues to occupy the same relation towards myself which he has chosen to assume for a year past; yet, as that Magazine is the organ of the Associate Reformed Synod of the North, there seems to be a necessity for noticing its course that we may know the true relation which that church sustains in respect to our own. Such a knowledge is necessary that we may not be found, on the one hand, condemning what is praiseworthy, nor on the other, giving countenance to that which is sinful. Should you be of the same mind, the following remarks are at your disposal.*

C. W.

Cannonsburgh, February 12, 1836.

That the reader may have the question fairly before him it is deemed advisable to quote the article entire from the Christian Magazine.

"THE RELIGIOUS MONITOR.

"By the December number of this work, the first with which we have been favored for some months, although we have regularly sent the editor our Magazine, we perceive that it has passed into new hands. We trust it will be improved by the change. Mr. Webster, in taking leave of his patrons, gives the Associate Reformed church, 'the last shot in his locker,' or his 'last kick at the English.'

"In this connexion, it should be noticed that the Secession cause appears at present to be more exposed to its enemies by the trimming course of our Associate Reformed brethren, than from any other cause. Professing to adhere to Secession principles, while in practice she denies those principles; maintaining a constitution separate from the General Assembly, while holding occasional communion with that church; and enjoin-

* We cannot well object to the insertion of Mr. W's Remarks; believing as we do that great injustice was done him by the editor of the Ch. Mag: in the notice referred to.—[Ed. REL. MON.]

ing upon her own people the use of an inspired psalmody, while her ministers are constantly in the habit of singing psalms of human composure, whenever they have an opportunity of conducting the public worship in those congregations where a human psalmody is habitually used; they ought not, and cannot rightly be regarded in any other light than that of a backsliding church. And these facts cause the proposition recently made by the Associate Reformed Synod for a new version of the Psalms, to look exceedingly suspicious. That proposal comes from the wrong quarter. Of course no allusion is here made to individuals. That church is here spoken of as a public body, professing to be a witness for Jesus Christ. And in that respect let *Seceders* beware of her pernicious influence, remembering that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

"This is a mixture of peevishness and mistakes. The Associate Reformed church does not deny Secession principles. We hope there are few of our brethren in the Associate church, who concur in Mr. Webster's doctrine that Secession principles consist in nothing but singing David's Psalms, and holding close communion. The statement, that we propose a new version of the Psalms, to the exclusion of those now in use, is altogether disingenuous. It is at least four times stated in the Preamble to the Resolutions of our Synod on this subject, that no such thing is desired or intended. The attachment of the Associate Reformed church to a scriptural psalmody is unshaken, Mr. Webster's judgment and sentence to the contrary notwithstanding."

In order to set this matter in a clear light, it may be proper to analyze and confirm the statement of the Monitor which the Magazine calls "a mixture of peevishness and mistakes;" and then advert a little to the objections, or assertions of the Magazine against that statement.

But before we proceed further, let it be understood that the following remarks are intended to apply particularly to the Associate Reformed Synod of the North. As there are three separate and independent Associate Reformed Synods; and as our information respecting those of the South and West is limited, so, it is necessary that they be excepted, in this article.

The matter being thus fairly before us, we may observe, that the statement of the monitor is in substance as follows, viz: That the Associate Reformed Synod of the North, is distinctly charged with a professed "adherence to Secession principles, while in practice she denies those principles;" especially on the Article of Psalmody. And the inferences drawn from this fact are, that she ought not, and cannot rightly be regarded in any any other light than that of a backsliding church; that this fact causes her proposition for a new version of the Psalms to look exceedingly suspicious; and that Seceders should beware of her pernicious influence as a public witnessing body for Jesus Christ.

Now in support of the first part of the proposition, viz: that the Associate Reformed Church *professes* to adhere to Secession principles, on the article of Psalmody, we offer the following proofs, viz:

1. Her public standards; "It is the will of God that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms, be sung in his worship, both public and private, to the end of the world."* It is true they afterwards throw a mist over this clear and explicit statement, by adding—"nor shall any composes *merely* human, be sung in any of the Associate Reformed Churches." The insertion of the word *merely* justly exposes them to the charge of insincerity; because it may with truth be said by the advocates of a human Psalmody, (Watt's for instance,) that they are not *merely* human. But the first quoted sentence has no ambiguity.† Besides we have,

2dly. The authority of the Christian magazine in support of our proposition: "The Associate Reformed Church does not deny Secession principles." It is true, the editor does not add on the article of Psalmody;

* Constitution of the Associate Reformed Church, p. 410, Pittsburgh edit. 1832.

† The writer is mistaken in this statement. For the sentence referred to is highly ambiguous. There are thousands who believe "that it is the will of God that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms be sung in his worship," who also believe and profess that mere human composes may in like manner be used in the worship of God: Had the word *exclusively* been used to qualify the proposition it would have rendered it unambiguous. The United Secession Church in Scotland on the subject of Psalmody express themselves, in their Testimony, as it is called, precisely in the same manner as the Associate Reformed Church has done; and honest Seceders there have not failed to charge them with a designed ambiguity of expression.—[ED. REL. MON.]

but if the sentence have any meaning, that must be it; for Psalmody is the subject in dispute.

Again, the number before us has a sensible and judicious article (page 29) going to show that *the use of human systems of praise* is one cause of division in the visible church, particularly deplorable, which it is believed could be profitably transferred to the pages of the Monitor. It will show conclusively that the Associate Synod of the North still professes adherence to Secession principles on the Article of Psalmody. We have been thus particular for the special benefit of such as are in the habit of regarding a consistent and practical adherence to religious principle as nothing more than "a mixture of peevishness and mistakes."

In proof of the second branch of our proposition, viz: that the Associate Reformed Church denies Secession principles in practice on the Article of Psalmody; we call the attention of the reader to the well known fact that her best ministers are in the habit of preaching occasionally in pulpits belonging to other denominations, where a human Psalmody alone is used. This practice has long existed. But she has not as a church lifted her finger against it. To prevent all quibbling on this point, though it is painful to do so, we must notice some particular instances. To say nothing of the long continued practice of the Rev. Alex. Proudft, D.D. on this point, we state distinctly that during the last summer, the Rev. Wm. McAuley, of Kortright, one of the most venerable ministers in that church, preached in the 3d Dutch Church in the city of Albany, where human composures were sung on the occasion. And we ask the editor of the Christian Magazine, how long it is since he preached for a minister of the General Assembly in the village of Johnstown, where a human system of praise was used on the occasion? and yet he goes home and seriously tells the readers of his Magazine, that one cause of division, particularly deplorable, in the visible church, *is the use of human systems of praise*, as if it were really a matter of conscience with him! Did we not do well to warn Seceders to beware of the pernicious influence of the Associate Reformed Church? "Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preacheest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you."

There are many sensible laymen in the Associate Reformed Church, with some of whom we have an acquaintance, who are justly esteemed for their personal worth, and christian deportment; but if they had not lost in a great measure the zeal and spirit of their reforming ancestors, they would never support a ministry who act with such inconsistency. How is this, brethren? You have solemnly professed to the world that "it is the WILL OF GOD, that the sacred songs contained in the Book of Psalms, be sung in his worship both public and private to the end of the world;" and your ministers enjoin this upon *you*, while *they* exercise the privilege of disregarding the will of God in this matter whenever it suits their pleasure or convenience. We say how is this? If your profession be good, will you permit those who are bound to maintain it to disregard it at pleasure? If bad, why is it solemnly made in the presence of God and men? Why not expunge it from your Constitution, and let both the friends and foes of a Covenanted Reformation know where to find you? "If the Lord be God follow him; but if Baal, then follow him."

In whatever light we view this policy in our Associate Reformed brethren, it is deplorable. It is so in respect to themselves. That servant who knew his master's will and did it not was beaten with many stripes: yet they profess to know his will, but do it not. They see the current of public opinion like an overflowing flood setting against an institution of God's own appointment, yet instead of coming up to the help of the Lord

against the mighty ; they seek the company and the friendship of the enemy, and give them countenance and encouragement, while they are seeking to rob God of that honor which is his due. But they not only rob God, they rob his people also of that consolation which is found in the sacred and precious songs of his own inditing. "When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him."

But this conduct of our Associate Reformed brethren has a most pernicious influence upon others. First, upon those denominations who are in the habit of using human composures. They see that it is not a matter of conscience with those who make such loud professions ; and that they would discard an inspired Psalmody altogether were it not for the fear of offending a few superstitious old men, who are "behind the intelligence of the age." Secondly, their influence is most pernicious on our own people ; many reason with themselves, that the Associate Reformed are so near us that we should unite with them ; or at least we may do so when it is convenient. They sing a scripture Psalmody ! And on the same principle, when in that church, they might unite with the General Assembly, saying, our ministers also sing Watts or Dwight occasionally ! And so the stone might roll, till this precious treasure shall be numbered among the things that were ; or known only to some literary antiquarian. Let the church be once wholly divested of this treasure ; and there will be another pillar of the Reformation gone.

These things are not mistakes, neither are they said in peevishness, but with unfeigned grief. They cannot but be a source of lamentation to any man who has his eyes open to see the true state of things among us. The Man of sin straining every nerve to extend his dominion over this fair inheritance of our fathers ; infidelity flourishing apace both in church and state, and joining hands with Popery for the accomplishment of their nefarious plot. And while this work is progressing out of the church, a far more dangerous work of devastation is going on within. One bulwark after another of the Reformation is demolished, and even many of those who solemnly profess to maintain Reformation principles, deny them in practice.

Again : It is no pleasing task to point out the sins of men. It is the most certain road to reproach and contempt, especially in a time of general defection. Yet the christian who shrinks from the discharge of this painful duty, when a fit opportunity presents itself, does so at his peril. And the keenness of the opposition which he is called to encounter in such circumstances will be graduated by the professions of those whose delinquencies are exposed. The higher their pretensions the sharper will they whet their tongues. "Thus saying thou reproachest us also," said the pharisees to the Saviour. Neither Satan nor the world care what christians profess, provided they do not reduce their professions to practice. But when christians are found faithful in any good degree, the scene changes. All the difficulty that ever occurred in the world respecting religion, turned on this very point. It was for bearing witness against the perfidiousness of God's ancient covenant people, that prophets and holy men were stoned, and sawn asunder ; were tempted and slain with the sword. It was for the same offence that the Lord of glory was crucified. It was the same offence that converted most of the nations of Europe into a field of blood, at and subsequent to the period of the Reformation.

The church has made a confederacy with the world ; she has settled down under a dishonorable peace with her natural and necessary enemy. And this is the true secret of her outward peace ; while she continues to evince so many marks of inward and spiritual decay. She looks to Egypt and Assyria for help ; but this friendship with the world is enmity against God. And this enmity exhibits itself by a *growing indifference* to those peculiarities of christianity which are most offensive to the taste of the

polite, the gay, the fashionable, and the worldly minded; and by a *bitter and persecuting spirit* towards such as would warn them of their danger, that they may escape those terrible judgments which must sooner or later come with unerring certainty upon ever branch of the visible church, that persists in a course of begun defection. That defection from truth which has been once attained and professed, involves the highest degree of guilt of which the church is capable, and exposes her to the most tremendous judgments. This is a truth graven on every page of the sacred writings in characters durable as the hand that formed them; sealed in the blood of martyrs, and confirmed by the history of the world. The Jewish nation from the commencement of its national existence to the coming of Christ, constituted the visible church of God—the only true church. She was also a most accurate type of the New Testament church, and we find this to have been her constant, her most besetting sin, with few exceptions, throughout the whole period of her history. They murmured against God, they forsook him; they rejected him; they refused to put their trust in him; they continually provoked him to wrath. This was the sin for which their carcasses fell in the wilderness; for which their nobles were slain, their temple destroyed, and themselves made captives seventy years under the cruel oppression of the fierce Chaldeans; and for which they were at last as a nation and church totally destroyed, by the infliction of judgments, the bare recital of which is enough to cause the flesh to crawl, and the ear to tingle. And in all this God vindicates himself: “What iniquity have your fathers found in me, that they are gone far from me, and have walked after vanity, and have become vain?” (Jer. ii. 5.)

But nine-tenths of professors in our day will start up at all that we have said, and cry shame, bigotry, censoriousness, peevishness, want of charity towards others. Now all this is the syren song of Satan. It is a point which he guards with most sedulous care; for he well knows that if he can get professors to suffer sin upon one another without lifting the warning voice, he will soon have the most of them to grace his retinue. People must learn to distinguish between a *true* and a *pure* church; between the *being* and *well-being* of a church. And they must not cease to warn their professing brethren of the dangers to which they are exposed, and sedulously guard them against the least inroads of defection. The Jewish nation was always the *true* church till God destroyed her for her defections. Yet read the denunciations of the prophets against her for her backslidings, and learn not to be led astray by the example of any man, or body of men, who profess Christ, while they deny him in a single iota of doctrine or practice. In a time of defection, such for instance as prevails in our day, then is the “hour of temptation that cometh on the world to try them that dwell upon the earth.” (Rev. iii. 10.) In such a time the whole christian world may cry peace, peace, and prate of their own glorious doings; and were it possible they would deceive the very elect. (Matt. xxiv. 24.) The teachers of heresy in such a time, are far more numerous, than the faithful witnesses of Jesus Christ. They are “many.” (Matt. xxiv. 11.) At such a time people are perfectly willing to suffer sin upon a brother. Any attempt to correct his error would offend him; and we must have peace; and besides their own hands not being altogether clean, their neighbor might retort upon them; “Physician heal thyself.” So they go on corrupt and corrupting one another. Men hear of the threatened evil, but care for none of these things. They have no concern in the matter; they look on such as would impress their minds with the coming danger as dyspeptics, troubled with groundless suspicions and fears.

But it is not merely *indifference* that prevails and sheds its blasting and mildew over the prosperity of the church. This defection is ever

accompanied with a *bitter and persecuting spirit*. "Then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another." *Shall betray one another*. This is not a persecution from outward enemies, but from secret foes, who have crept into the sacred enclosure. The church never loses either truth or holiness by the persecutions of avowed enemies; but she suffers loss of both by wolves in sheep's clothing. Who have been the most unrelenting persecutors? Surely they that slew the prophets. And they were professors. It is probable that half the persecutions which Christians suffered under the emperors of Rome, was instigated by the Arians and other heretics. We need not point to Popery. And who are the persecutors in our day? They are false professors who have publicly professed a creed which they do not believe, or will not practice. Read the outrageous slanders and violent proceedings of the New School men in the General Assembly against their own church.

Lest some humble christian should be too much dejected in mind by a consideration of the low state of the church, that we have here represented it to be in, at this time, it is proper to observe that in all this confusion and falling away of professors, the true believer has nothing to fear. "The Lord knoweth them that are his." Those who forsake the truth, no matter what may have been their professions, never saw its true glory and importance, or felt its saving power. "They went out from us that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us." Besides God will in his own set time arise and have mercy upon Zion; and that time may be nearer than many suppose. His promise is that "at evening time it shall be light." But it should be remembered that when he brings deliverance to his church it will be in the way of leading her into all truth. She will then go forth by the footsteps of the flock; she will enquire diligently for the old paths and the good way. Then shall the saints take pleasure in the stones, and favor the dust of Zion. (Ps. cii. 14.) They will no longer esteem any revealed truth a small matter. They will not deny their profession by a contrary practice.

It was proposed to answer the objections of the Christian Magazine, but this article is growing to an unreasonable length, and besides it would be an insult to the understanding of the reader to offer any reply to such objections, did not experience teach us that multitudes seem willing to take any thing in the form of religion however puerile or even ridiculous it may be; therefore we shall be very brief.

1. "The Associate Reformed Church does not deny Secession principles." This is precisely what we had asserted; so far from denying them, she *professes* but does not *practice* them.

2. "We hope there are few of our brethren in the Associate Church, who concur in Mr. Webster's doctrine, that Secession principles consist in nothing but singing David's Psalms, and holding close communion." We hardly know which most to admire the folly or presumption of this statement. Let the reader cast his eye back to the extract in which Mr. McLaren finds this doctrine, and see if he can find any such thing in it. If his readers really believe him, they are certainly to be pitied. And I can see no reason why such a statement is made unless Mr. McL. goes on the supposition that we are not under obligation to keep the whole law. "He that keepeth the whole law," says divine inspiration, "and yet offendeth in one point is guilty of all." Singing an inspired Psalmody is a part of the law; and consequently a part of Secession principles; therefore he who sings human composures is guilty of all, and has, "in practice" denied Secession principles. I hope the reader will understand this reasoning; but I have no hope that I shall be able to make myself understood by the editor of the Christian Magazine.

The reader is requested to turn back to the head of this article and read

the next two sentences, and then examine the extract from which they purport to be taken, and see how much resemblance they bear to each other. Indeed I could not have supposed it possible to crowd so many perversions and misrepresentations within the compass of eight or ten lines, as are here contained, had I not seen things of the same kind before, from the same quarter.

3. "The attachment of the Associate Reformed Church to a Scriptural Psalmody is unshaken, Mr. Webster's *judgment* and *sentence* to the contrary notwithstanding." We have no doubt, that her *attachment* is just as *unshaken* as ever it was. She never would, and will not now depart from a Scriptural Psalmody, only when her ministers have a desire to show their skill and orthodoxy to some of those congregations where a human Psalmody is used.

As to the last part of the sentence, I suppose we are to take that for one of his "little veins of satire," of which he is so fond, and of which he sometimes gives us information, lest we should carelessly overlook them, and lose their beauty.

ART. VI. *Miscellaneous Items.*

OBERLIN INSTITUTE.—A writer in the Salem (Mass.) Landmark, gives the following information respecting the Oberlin Institute, located in Lorain County, Ohio, in which Rev. C. G. Finney, who has obtained so much renown for his *New Light, New Measures and Fanaticism*, is Professor of Theology.

"The President of the Oberlin Institute, Rev. Asa Mahan, had but just entered upon the duties of his office, when he publicly ridiculed and stigmatized the study of the classics. He admitted the necessity of studying the Greek language, in order that the scholar might read the New Testament in the original. Such was the effect of his denunciation, that a *general bonfire* of Latin books was made by the students. The Professor of Languages, Rev. Mr. Waldo, finding it impossible to acquiesce in the views of the President, and of the Trustees who sustained the President, resigned his office. A letter from him, containing a comprehensive view of the case, now lies before me. It bears date, Oberlin, Aug. 5, 1835.

A recent catalogue of the Institute gives the course of study. From this, it appears, that a miserable pittance of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, constitute the requisition of languages. In regard to the other features of the course of study, I will only say, that no genuine New England scholar will be found, who would anticipate any very splendid results from the prescribed plan of education at Oberlin.

I had known of schools and academies in which both sexes have been taught; but I never before knew the like of what is a material part of the system of this Institute. The catalogue for 1835, has the names of 203 males, and 75 females. Of these last it is said—"They board at the public table, and perform the labor of the Steward's Department, together with washing, ironing, and much of the sewing for the students." "They attend recitations with the young gentlemen in all the departments."

Think now of this picture, from the published catalogue of this Institute! *Males and females all take their meals at the same tables in a Common Hall; and all attend recitations together in all the departments!*

I have been informed by those who know whereof they affirm, that changes are made from time to time in the order of sitting at table, so that the advantages of this intermixing of the sexes may be secured to all alike. An eye-witness assures me of the fact; which has also been reported in my hearing by men of the highest character for credibility.

It is true that the catalogue says of the young ladies, "Their rooms are entirely separate from those of the other sex, and no calls or visits in their respective apartments are at all permitted."

I waive any further particulars. Much more I could state as matters of fact and subject of serious consideration. But I cannot refrain from adding, that all or nearly all the favorite views of our wisest and best men, from the landing at Plymouth to the present moment, have been treated contemptuously at Oberlin. I speak advisedly. Our general system of education, our manner of religious instruction and influence, in

fact, every thing in our institutions of learning and theology in which we have been accustomed to repose confidence, as a means of substantial and permanent good, has been repeatedly subjected to the severest invective and ridicule by members of the present Faculty of the Oberlin Institute."

DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.—There has been much enquiry of late as to what are the doctrines of the church of Rome, in reference to the duty of confessors in the case of flagrant crimes coming to their knowledge. The following quotations from Dens' Theology, state the theory, and the infamous conduct of a priest at Cork, when summoned as a witness upon a trial for murder, which will be fresh within the memory of our readers, and will illustrate the practice. Truly Dens has not been circulated in vain.

"Q. Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal? *A.* It cannot be given, although on it should depend the life or safety of men, or even the destruction of the State, &c."—"Q. What then, ought a confessor to reply when interrogated concerning truth which he knows, from sacramental confession alone? *A.* He ought to reply that he does not know it; and if necessary should confirm the same with an oath."—*Objection:* In no case is it lawful to tell a lie; but that confessor would tell a lie, because he does know the truth. *Answer:* I deny the minor; because such confessor is interrogated as man; now he does not know that truth as man, although he may know it as God;" so says S. H. q. c1, art. 1, ad. 3, &c.—"Q. What if it be directly asked of the confessor whether he knows it from sacramental confession? *A.* In this case he ought to answer nothing (so Stey. cum Sylvio) but the question is to be rejected as impious; or he might even say absolutely, not relatively, to the proposer of the question—"I know nothing about it," because the word 'I,' restrains it to human knowledge."

We spend not a syllable of indignation upon these demoralizing, and worse than Pagan doctrines. Only let the reader remember that they are the avowed code of the Papal priesthood.

It is amongst the strange anomalies of the human mind, that the gross superstitions of Popery do not convince all persons of common intelligence within its pale of its absurdity; unless, indeed, we suppose that they are convinced already, and that they confirm to its rites merely for secular convenience just as Mr. O'Connell went down upon his knees in the streets, to flatter the delusions of the blind multitude, in order to secure votes at the hustings. Can any thing be more monstrously absurd in the superstitions of a Hottentot or New Zealander, than making the Virgin Mary a Field-marshal? Yet what Papists would venture to question the sobriety of the following recent proclamation:—"Army of the King, Don Carlos V.—Royal Decree.—The most holy Virgin de los Dolores having been declared by me Generalissimo of my troops, it became my duty, from motives of veneration and piety, to distinguish with the title of Generalissimo the Royal standard, which bears for its device this august image; and in consequence I ordain that this august and royal standard be not lowered before any person, not even before me; and that the same honors and salutes be rendered to it as to the holy Sacrament. Given at Estella, this 2d August, 1835.

"I, the King."

London *Chris. Obsv.*

ART. VII. Notices.

TO THE READER.—In the extract from "The Christian World Unmasked," there is a passage which seems to favor the opinion that CHRIST is only offered to *sensible sinners* and that none others have a right to accept of him. This opinion has been long since justly discarded by the generality of Calvinistic divines. It is a precious truth, that a free and full offer of salvation is made to mankind *indiscriminately* wherever the gospel comes; and that co-extensive with the offer is the warrant to embrace it. "Hearken unto me, ye stout-hearted, that are far from righteousness; I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry." "Who-soever will, let him come and take the water of life freely."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The communication signed, "A Seceder," though containing some excellent thoughts and suggestions, is judged unfit for insertion in its present shape. When this correspondent shall send us his proposed "Plan for the improvement of the West," together with his name, it will receive due consideration, and if thought to be of sufficient importance, it will find a place in the Monitor.

.....

1941

CONTENTS.

	page.		page.
ART. I. Immersion not the Scripture mode of Baptism,.....	289	ART. V. The Associate Reformed Synod of the North,.....	313
ART. II. Remarks on the Mode of Baptism,.....	294	ART. VI. <i>Miscellaneous Items</i> —Oberlin Institute,.....	319
ART. III. Review of Dick's Lectures on Theology,.....	290	Doctrines of the Church of Rome,.....	320
ART. IV. The Christian World unmasked, (continued from page 292,).....	305	ART. VII. <i>Notices</i> —To the Reader,	320
		To Correspondents,.....	320

NOTICE.

THE subscriber has purchased, together with the *Monitor*, all its outstanding subscription dues, which amount to about \$2,400, and he hopes he may not be allowed to suffer in his pecuniary interests by the non-payment of the same. He will esteem it as a special favor to have remittances made as soon as possible, that he may be able to meet his engagements. It is hoped that those acting as agents will give attention to this matter.—All letters and communications must be addressed to the subscriber and be *post paid*, unless when enclosing money or the names of new subscribers, or when relating *immediately* to the interests of the *Monitor*.—Former agents are humbly requested to continue their agency. In the subscriber's absence, persons visiting the city can transact business in relation to the *Monitor*, by calling on Mr. ANDREW WHITE, at the printing office, No. 71 State-street.

JAMES MARTIN.

N. B. It is proposed, if our subscription list will warrant it, to add one half to the present size of the *Monitor*, after Vol. XII is completed. It is, therefore, necessary that the names of new subscribers be forwarded to us as soon as possible, that we may make our arrangements accordingly.

J. M.

AGENTS.

ALL MINISTERS AND PREACHERS OF THE ASSOCIATE CHURCH.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate Church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as agents:

<p>Wm. Stevenson, Junr., Cambridge, Washington Co. N. Y.</p> <p>Joseph M'Clelland, New-York City.</p> <p>A. Bachop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.</p> <p>G. A. Martin, Pittsburgh, Pa.</p> <p>Alex. Gailey, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co., Pa.</p> <p>Wm. McMillan, Potter's Mills, Centre Co., Pa.</p> <p>John Smith, Baltimore, Md.</p> <p>Andrew Munro, Canonsburgh, Pa.</p>	<p>E. Lauderdale, York, Livingston Co. N. Y.</p> <p>Tho's Cummings, Putnam, Wash'n Co. N. Y.</p> <p>James Galloway, Jr., Xenia, Ohio.</p> <p>James Wilson, Esq., Fawn Grove, York Co. Pa.</p> <p>Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.</p> <p>James Hutchinson, Esq., New London Cross Roads, Chester Co. Pa.</p> <p>John Smith, P. M., Pleasant Run, Carroll Co., Indiana.</p>
---	--

Subscribers in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri, are requested to make payment to the Synod's Missionaries, who will also receive and forward the names of new subscribers.

TERMS \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, or at the annual meeting of the Associate Synod.

